



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/728,647	12/01/2000	Shaikh Ghaleb Mohammad Yassin Alhamad	VI-CIP 5	5958

7590 07/16/2003
Charles E. Cates
Cates & Holloway
P.O. BOX 1532
Scottsdale, AZ 85252-1532

EXAMINER

WATKINS III, WILLIAM P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1772

12

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS-12

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/728,647

Applicant(s)

ALHAMAD, SHAIKH GHALEB
MOHAMMAD YASSIN

Examiner

William P. Watkins III

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The examiner has reviewed the small portion of the specification that is directed to the instant claimed embodiment of expanded material with tar and aggregate and cannot locate explicit support for the base material being non-rigid.

2. Claims 1-5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 12 now recite that there is a non-rigid base material formed from a sheet material with slits, but do not recite that the sheet material is expanded to form cells in the

Art Unit: 1772

non-rigid base material. Thus there is no antecedent basis for the reference to "the cells" at the end of the claim.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stock (U.S. 3,825,465) in view of Kinney (U.S. 3,12,864).

Stock teaches an expanded sheet material which may be made of plastics or paper or cardboard and which may be filled with tar products and an aggregate such as plaster (col. 2, lines 10-40). Kinney teaches the use of an expanded sheet material where the slits are transverse to the longitudinal direction of the sheet and intersect the edge of the sheet in order to be expanded into a three dimensional structure which has great strength and stiffness (page 2, lines 25-35, Figure 1). A compact intermediate form of the product is taught (Figures 3

Art Unit: 1772

and 2). The instant invention claims an expanded sheet material with tar and aggregate. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select a combination of tar and plaster from the possible coating and filler materials taught by Stock as options. It further would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the transverse slits of Kinney for the longitudinal slits of Stock in order to produce a strong and still structure because of the teachings of Kinney. Variation of the taught sheet materials with these coating and fillers would also have been obvious. Transportation of construction materials to a job site in a compact form for field assembly is well known in the construction art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to transport the unexpanded mesh of Stock in view of Kinney in a common intermediate compact sheet material storage form such as a roll for field assembly and joining with aggregate and tar in order to have ease of transportation to the construction job site, in view of the above noted well known practice.

5. Applicant's arguments filed 28 April 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the instant claim language of a non-rigid base material defines over the stiff base material of Stock. The examiner notes that the material of Stock may be a paper material that is not stiff until it is impregnated with tar (col. 2, lines 30-40). Thus the paper expanded sheet material of Stock is non-rigid at least until impregnation with resin or tar. This would appear to be similar to applicant's claimed process where the base material is expanded and formed into a non-rigid base material then impregnated with tar and aggregate which the examiner presumes stiffens the cells so that they do not collapse. The examiner does not understand how applicant's new claim language distinguishes over the cited art. Applicant's other arguments have been previously addressed.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS**

Art Unit: 1772

of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William P. Watkins III whose telephone number is 703-308-2420. The examiner works an increased flex time schedule, but can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 11:30 A.M. through 8:00 P.M. Eastern Time. The examiner returns all calls within one business day unless an extended absence is noted on his voice mail greeting.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 703-308-4251. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.

Application/Control Number: 09/728,647

Page 7

Art Unit: 1772

WW/ww

July 14, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William P. Watkins III". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "W" and "I".

**WILLIAM P. WATKINS III
PRIMARY EXAMINER**